

II. REMARKS

The Office Action dated August 8, 2007, has been received and carefully noted. The amendments made herein and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-10 and 12-20 are pending.

By this amendment, claim 10 has been amended. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification and claims as originally filed. For example, support for the amendment to claim 10 can be found in the specification on page 11, lines 18-21. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejection.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Visca et al. (EP 1006168). Applicants traverse the rejection.

Present claim 10 is directed to a "method of conferring anti-corrosive properties to metal substrata and their alloys comprising: (1) applying a (per)fluoropolyether having a formula selected from:



and (2) performing a thermal treatment of the metal substrates and their alloys at a temperature in the range of 60°C to 250°C" (emphasis added).

Applicants submit that Visca et al. does not teach or suggest the second step of the presently claimed method, "performing a thermal treatment of the metal substrates and their alloys at a temperature in the range of 60°C to 250°C."

For at least the above reasons, Applicant request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Visca et al.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Visca et al. Applicants traverse the rejection.

As discussed above, Applicants submit that Visca et al. does not disclose the presently claimed invention. Applicants also submit that Visca et al. does not render the presently claimed invention obvious.

Applicants submit that based on the teachings of Visca et al. and without the benefit of hindsight, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have the suggestion of the second step of “performing a thermal treatment of the metal substrates and their alloys at a temperature in the range of 60°C to 250°C” (claim 10).

Applicants note that the technical problem of the presently claimed invention is to obtain thin coatings on metal substrata having anti-corrosive properties, as an alternative to PTFE-based coatings. Applicants note that the drawback of PTFE-based coatings is that their application is carried out at very high temperatures, at which metals tend to get easily deformed (see specification, page 13, line 18 to page 14, line 1). Applicants have found that the perfluoropolyether compounds of formula (C) and (D) of claim 10 solve this technical problem.

Applicants refer to Table 2 on page 31 of the specification, which shows the results of corrosion tests carried out on an untreated copper plate and a treated copper plate (see comparative Example 10 on page 25). The specimens are put into contact with air having a high degree of humidity (relative humidity = 80%); metal corrosion is evaluated by visual evaluation according to ASTM D130/IP154 (score number) after 24

hours and after one month. Untreated copper plates show strong corrosion (score = 3b) after 24 hours, and after one month, the corrosion is complete (score = 4a). When the perfluoropolyether silanes are applied according to the method of the present invention, the following results are found: when the silanes are applied in a solution at a concentration of 1% by weight (Example 11 on page 26), the copper specimens show moderate corrosion (score = 2a) after one month. When the silanes are applied in a solution at a concentration of 5% by weight (Example 12 on page 27), the copper specimens show a less corrosion (score = 1a) after one month, which is a lower score than that found in Example 11. In the case of perfluoropolyether phosphates, the following results are found: when the perfluoropolyether phosphates are applied in a solution at a concentration of 1% by weight (Example 13 on page 28), the copper specimens show a strong corrosion (score = 3b) after one month. The result does not change when the concentration of the perfluoropolyether phosphates in the application solution is increased to 5% (see Example 14 on page 29).

Applicants submit that there is no teaching or suggestion in Visca et al. to the solution of the technical problem or how to achieve the solution. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Visca et al. in the manner of the Applicants.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 over Visca et al.

III. CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below to schedule a personal or telephone interview to discuss any remaining issues.

In the event this response is not timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension, along with any other additional fees which may be required with respect to this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing Attorney Docket No. 108910-00051.

Respectfully submitted,

ARENT FOX LLP



Yelee Y. Kim
Registration No. 60,088

Customer No. 004372
Arent Fox LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 857-6395

RJB/YYK:meu